



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,489	08/24/2006	Yasuhiro Kuwahara	2006_1385A	1063
52349 7590 09/10/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			EXAMINER GE, YUZHEN	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/10/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com  
coa@wenderoth.com

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,489	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KUWAHARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> YUZHEN GE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) YUZHEN GE.

(2) Stephen Kopchik (Reg. Num. 61,215).

**Date of Interview:** 7 September 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)  
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**  
Rejection(s) discussed:  
  
  
Claims discussed:  
  
  
Prior art documents discussed:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

  

**Part II.**  
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*The examiner called the applicant's representative to ask for an explanation of the illustrative figures on Page 12 of the Remarks dated 8/16/2010. The examiner also explained that the reference by Torigoe et al can be used to reject claim 1 since Torigoe et al also considered the situation when the selected point is on a line between two apexes (paragraph [0072]-[0074]. The examiner indicated that if the applicant could amend the claims to distinguish the instant invention from the reference then the examiner could do an examiner's amendment to allow the case.*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Yuzhen Ge/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)